



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/803,152	03/12/2001	Kouichi Shimamura	1095.1165	3265
21171	7590	03/22/2004	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			AKHAVANNIK, HUSSEIN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2621	

DATE MAILED: 03/22/2004

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/803,152

Applicant(s)

SHIMAMURA ET AL.

Examiner

Hussein Akhavannik

Art Unit

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 5 recites the limitation "said physical quantity" in lines 6 and 7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,892,515) in view of Cline et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,204,853).

Referring to claim 1, which is representative of claim 6,

- i. An information receiving unit which receives information on a three-dimensional model as an object to be analyzed is illustrated by Kobayashi et al in figure 1 by the input/output data processing unit 102. Kobayashi et al explain that the models are 3D in column 8, lines 58-61 and illustrate example models in figures 3 and 4.

- ii. An edge detecting unit which detects an edge of the three-dimensional model is not explicitly explained by Kobayashi et al. Kobayashi et al do explain that each edge line of the model is assigned to a coordinate axial direction in column 3, lines 41-60, inherently requiring that each edge of the model be detected. However, Cline et al explain in column 2, lines 55-67 that post-processing algorithms discern boundaries of 3D structures in order to segment different structures in an image. Cline et al give the example of segmenting a vessel wall from a blood pool in order to determine blockage of the vessels. Cline et al explain in column 2, lines 49-54 that the visualization of boundaries of objects is useful in many disciplines, such as the 3D model analyzing system of Kobayashi et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to detect edges of the 3D model inputted in the system of Kobayashi et al using the method suggested by Cline et al because both systems analyze edges of 3D objects and the edge detection method of Cline et al would improve the accuracy of the segmentation of the 3D model.
- iii. A smoothing unit which smoothes the edge is not explicitly explained by Kobayashi et al. However, Cline et al illustrate in figure 4 by the noise reduction filter 27 and explain in the abstract that a smoothing unit is used in order to smooth the detected edges. The smoothing filter of Cline et al reduces noise in the image, especially along the edges, without blurring across the edge. Noise present near the edges of the 3D model could create artifacts in the 3D model due to falsely detected edges. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

smooth the edges of the 3D model because artifacts will be reduced and a more accurate 3D will be generated.

iv. An analyzing unit which analyzes the three-dimensional model in accordance with a finite element method after the edge is smoothed by the smoothing unit is illustrated by Kobayashi et al in figure 1 by the finite element mesh generating unit 104. An example of an input 3D model being analyzed in accordance with the finite element method is illustrates by Kobayashi et al in figures 5 and 6.

Referring to claim 2, the edge detecting unit detecting only at least one edge having an angle which does not exceed a predetermined amount is explained by Kobayashi et al in column 19, line 50 to column 20, line 8. Kobayashi et al explain that the line segments (corresponding to edges) are constrained according to a desired direction (corresponding to an angle).

Referring to claim 3, the smoothing unit transforming the edge into a curved surface having a predetermined radius of curvature is not explicitly explained by Kobayashi et al. However, Cline et al explain that the smoothing filter employs a predetermined curvature (corresponding to the inverse of the radius) in column 3, lines 6-35 and illustrate the curvature in figure 2. Cline et al explain that the curvature is important so that edges are not blurred, thereby enhancing the edge. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transform an edge into a curved surface having a predetermined radius as suggested by Cline et al in the finite element analyses system of Kobayashi et al because the edges will be enhanced, resulting in a more accurate 3D model.

Referring to claim 4, the analyzing unit analyzing the three-dimensional model in accordance with the finite element method after dividing the three-dimensional model into a

Art Unit: 2621

plurality of hexahedral elements which are formed with edges each having a length shorter than the predetermined radius of curvature is explained by Kobayashi et al in column 11, lines 36-45. Kobayashi et al illustrate that the 3D models are divided into hexahedral elements in figures 5,6, and 10. Kobayashi et al also explain that the length of the line segments of the mapping models, corresponding to the radius of curvature, is longer than the length of the hexahedral elements.

5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi et al in view of Cline et al, and further in view of admitted prior art.

Referring to claim 5,

i. A number-of-divisions varying unit which varies the number of said plurality of hexahedral elements is not explicitly explained by Kobayashi et al or Cline et al.

However, the Applicant illustrates in figure 10 (labeled prior art) that the number of divisions are varied (on the x-axis) in order to determine the major principle stress.

ii. The analyzing unit determining a converged value of the physical quantity based on a local maximum of calculated values of the physical quantity which are obtained while increasing the number of the plurality of hexahedral elements by the number-of-divisions varying unit is not explicitly explained by Kobayashi et al or Cline et al.

However, the Applicant illustrates in figure 10 by the dashed line that the major principle stress converges to an asymptote. The local maximum of the calculated values (corresponding to the major principle stress) occurs at the largest number of divisions illustrated in figure 10. The number of divisions illustrated in figure 10 is not infinite and therefore, the maximum value is local to the number of divisions analyzed. Claim 5 does not require that the value of the physical quantity decrease after the local maximum. By

Art Unit: 2621

using the physical property analyzing method of the admitted prior art, features of the 3D model of Kobayashi et al and Cline et al may be determined. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in art at the time the invention was made to analyze the 3D model of Kobayashi et al and Cline et al by the method of the admitted prior art because the characteristics of the models can be analyzed.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kaufman (U.S. Patent No. 5,038,302) – To exhibit representing an edge by a series of voxels and 3D models made up of voxels as illustrated in figures 2 and 5A-7C.

Shimamura (U.S. Patent No. 6,671,656) – To exhibit the voxel method as illustrated in figure 1.

Shimamura (U.S. Patent No. 6,606,090) – To exhibit the voxel method as illustrated in figure 6.

Finnigan et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,345,490) – To exhibit the finite element method and edge detection by the octree method as illustrated in figure 1 and 2a-2c.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hussein Akhavannik whose telephone number is (703)306-4049. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.


Art Unit: 2621

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leo H. Boudreau can be reached on (703)305-4706. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hussein Akhavannik
March 16, 2004

H.A.



LEO BOUDREAU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600